arXiv:1608.05324v1 [quant-ph] 18 Aug 2016

Is non-locality stronger in higher dimensions?

Soumik Adhikary* and V. Ravishankar†
Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Delhi, New Delhi-110016, India.

Radha Pyari Sandhir‡
Department of Physics and Computer Science, Dayalbagh Educational Institute, Dayalbagh Rd., Agra, Uttar Pradesh-282005, India.

A critique of a prescription of non-locality [1–3] that appears to be stronger and more general than the Bell-CHSH formulation is presented. It is shown that, contrary to expectations, this prescription fails to correctly identify a large family of maximally non-local Bell states.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

Violation of the Bell inequality is an unmistakable signature of non-locality for any quantum system. This has been tested extensively and spectacularly in two qubit systems. Yet the formulation, though general enough to be applied to any bipartite quantum system, throws open the question of whether there could be non-local states which do *not* violate the Bell inequality. A definitive answer to this, in the negative, is available only for two qubit systems [4].The question remains to be settled for $N \times N$ systems.

In an attempt to resolve this issue, two new formulations of non-locality have been proposed by Kaszlikowski et al [1] and Collins et al [2] (see [3] for a general formulation, [5–7] for discussions of special cases). The formulations are equivalent and involve new inequalities which, of course, reduce to the standard Bell-CHSH form for two qubits. Remarkably, the inequalities – unlike in the Bell case – are dimension dependent, and are not constrained by the Cirel'son bound [8]. When applied to the fully entangled states and their contamination by white noise, shown below,

$$|\Psi_E\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_j |jj\rangle; \quad \rho = p|\Psi_E\rangle\langle\Psi_E| + (1-p)\frac{\mathbb{I}}{N^2}, \tag{1}$$

one is led to conclude that non-locality gets stronger with increasing dimensions, and that one can identify non-local states that evade the Bell analysis. The new inequalities are also verified experimentally [9–13], the last one involving coupled systems upto $N = 16$.

Thus the new inequalities hold the promise of generalising and subsuming the standard Bell analysis for identifying and characterising non-local states in higher dimensions. It is, therefore, an opportune moment to examine, in a greater detail, the domain of applicability of the new inequalities. For, as mentioned, the new inequalities and their experimental tests have been applied only on the states described by Eq. 1. This paper undertakes the task, for the specific case of two coupled 4-level systems, and examines whether the new inequalities are more discriminating of non-local states vis-a-vis the Bell-CHSH, or simply Bell, inequality. In this exercise, we consider the inequality proposed in [2], which we shall call as CGLMP, after the authors, and apply them on Bell states, i.e., those that violate Bell inequality maximally.

II. FORMULATION

A. Bell and CGLMP inequalities

For the sake of completeness, we describe the CGLMP inequality briefly, after mentioning the standard Bell inequality. Consider an $M \times N$ level system with two subsystems $A(B)$ of $M(N)$ levels. The Bell operator $\mathcal{B}$ is defined by,

$$\mathcal{B} = A_1B_1 - A_1B_2 + A_2B_1 + A_2B_2 \tag{2}$$

where $A_{1,2}$ and $B_{1,2}$ are local observables for the two subsystems, subject to the conditions $-1 \leq \langle A_i \rangle \leq 1$ and $-1 \leq \langle B_i \rangle \leq 1$. Local hidden variables models constrain the Bell function to obey the inequality $|\langle \mathcal{B} \rangle| \leq 2$, a violation of which implies non-locality. As a non-local theory, quantum mechanics pushes the upper bound to a value $2\sqrt{2}$ [8]. This bound is absolute and independent of M and N.

CGLMP inequality has a more complicated structure. The analog of the Bell operator is the function I_N, defined for an $N \times N$ level system by

* phz148122@physics.iitd.ac.in
† vravi@physics.iitd.ac.in
‡ radha.pyari@gmail.com

$$I_N = \sum_{k=0}^{[N/2]-1} \Big(1 - \frac{2k}{N-1}\Big)\{[P(A_1 = B_1 + k) + P(B_1 = A_2 + k + 1) + P(A_2 = B_2 + k) + P(B_2 = A_1 + k)] - [P(A_1 = B_1 - k - 1) + P(B_1 = A_2 - k) + P(A_2 = B_2 - k - 1) + P(B_2 = A_1 - k - 1)]\} \quad (3)$$

where $P(A_i, B_i)$ are joint measurement probabilities for local observables A_i, B_i belonging to the two subsystems. All the observables have integer eigenvalues $0, 1, \cdots, N-1$. The measurement prescription can be found in [5], and involves two local observers, Alice and Bob, who fine tune variable phases α_i, β_i (see Eq. 4) of the states in their respective subsystems, depending on the measurements they wish to perform. The measurement bases for the observables A_i and B_i; $i = 1, 2$ are of the form

$$|K\rangle_{A,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} exp\Big(i\frac{2\pi}{N} j(K + \alpha_i)\Big) |j\rangle_A$$
$$|L\rangle_{B,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} exp\Big(i\frac{2\pi}{N} j(-L + \beta_i)\Big) |j\rangle_B. \quad (4)$$

Rules of classical probability impose the constraint $|I_N| \leq 2$. This constraint is interpreted as a locality condition inasmuch as it arises in measurements involving joint probabilities.

On evaluating I_N for the maximally entangled state, it is found that the maximum value of I_N as allowed by quantum theory transcends the Cirel'son bound when $N \geq 3$. It takes a value 2.8962 when $N = 4$, and approaches the limiting value of 2.9696 as $N \to \infty$. Since $I_4 > 2\sqrt{2}$ for the Bell state, it follows that some noisy states (defined in Eq. 1), will obey Bell inequality but violate CGLMP, buttressing the claim that CGLMP prescription is more general and stronger than the Bell prescription. As remarked, experiments are also performed on maximally entangled states.

III. CRITIQUE OF CGLMP INEQUALITY

We wish to contrast the CGLMP inequality with the Bell formulation for a broader class of states for a 4×4 level system. In this, we freely exploit the abundance of Bell states which are not restricted to be fully entangled, or even pure. We follow the analysis in [14] closely in the construction of Bell states.

A. Bell states of 4×4 level systems

It is known that the conditions on the local observables for attaining the Cirel'son bound are given by [15]

$$\big\langle A_{1,2}^2 \big\rangle = \big\langle B_{1,2}^2 \big\rangle = 1$$
$$\big\langle \{A_1, A_2\} \big\rangle \text{ or } \big\langle \{B_1, B_2\} \big\rangle = 0. \quad (5)$$

The two conditions jointly constitute the definition of Clifford Algebra, the representations of which are essentially given by the standard Pauli matrices or their direct sums for each pair of observables. It follows thereof that maximally non-local Bell states are either coherent, or incoherent superpositions of Bell states in mutually orthogonal 2×2 sectors. This is a consequence of Jordan's theorem [14, 15]. This explains why there are no fully entangled Bell states when N is odd.

Armed with this result we conveniently choose the observables to be

$$A_1 = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}\lambda_8 + \frac{\sqrt{6}}{3}\lambda_{15}; \quad A_2 = (\lambda_4 + \lambda_{11})$$
$$B_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(A_1 + A_2); \quad B_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(A_2 - A_1) \quad (6)$$

where the $SU(4)$ generators (the λ matrices) are taken in their standard form. The spectrum of the Bell operator is easily determined. It has the eigen-resolution

$$\mathcal{B} = 2\sqrt{2}(\Pi_{\mathcal{H}_+} - \Pi_{\mathcal{H}_-}) \quad (7)$$

where $dim(\mathcal{H}_\pm) = 4$. The bases for $\mathcal{H}_\pm$ may be chosen to be

$$|\eta_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|11\rangle + |33\rangle); \quad |\eta_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |32\rangle)$$
$$|\eta_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |23\rangle); \quad |\eta_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |22\rangle) \quad (8)$$

and

$$|\phi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|31\rangle - |13\rangle); \quad |\phi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|30\rangle - |12\rangle)$$
$$|\phi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|21\rangle - |03\rangle); \quad |\phi_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|20\rangle - |02\rangle) \quad (9)$$

respectively. Within each sector, all states, both pure and mixed, violate the Bell inequality maximally. Thus, in contrast to the two qubit case, Bell states can have ranks ranging from $1-4$. We consider states belonging to $\mathcal{H}_+$ henceforth. We examine the pure and mixed states separately in the next section.

B. Comparison of Bell and CGLMP measures

1. Pure states

The comparison requires a numerical study of the behaviour of I_4. It is convenient to represent a pure Bell state in the form

$$|\Psi\rangle_{\mathcal{H}_+} = \sum_i c_i \, |\eta_i\rangle \quad ; \quad \sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1 \tag{10}$$

with the parametrisation

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \cos\theta_1 \\ c_2 &= \exp(i\gamma_1)\sin\theta_1\cos\theta_2 \\ c_3 &= \exp(i\gamma_2)\sin\theta_1\sin\theta_2\cos\theta_3 \\ c_4 &= \exp(i\gamma_3)\sin\theta_1\sin\theta_2\sin\theta_3. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The states constitute a six dimensional manifold $\mathcal{M}^6 \equiv \mathcal{S}^3 \times (\mathcal{S}^1)^{\otimes 3}$. The task consists of optimising the tunable phases α_i, β_i (Eq. 4) in order to maximise I_4. For instance, numerical simulations performed in [5] determine the optimal values for the maximally entangled state $|\Psi_E\rangle$ to be $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (0, 1/2); (\beta_1, \beta_2) = (1/4, -1/4)$.This configuration yields a value of $I_4 = 2.8962$, which is in excess of $2\sqrt{2}$.

The method

In order find the maximum I_4 value for each state, we implement the Nelder-Mead optimization technique [16], to search over the 4-dimensional phase parameter space spanned by $\{\alpha_{1,2}, \beta_{1,2}\}$. The same technique was used in [1, 5] to optimise the parameters for the fully entangled state. This method does not always guarantee convergence; the search stops when the 'standard error' falls under a certain pre-defined value: $\sqrt{\frac{1}{n+1}\sum_{i=0}^{n}(f(x_1) - \overline{f(x_i)})^2}$. Its success depends on the simplex not becoming too small in relation to the curvature of the surface. If the simplex is too small, chances of it being trapped in a local maxima are high. However, through selection of different initial test points across the parameter space to commence the search, one can avoid repeatedly falling into the same local maxima, and a global maxima can be obtained.

For each state in our simulations, a number of such searches were performed. Henceforth, we simply denote I_4 as the maximum value pertaining to each state across these multiple searches. 1000 pure states were sampled randomly from $\mathcal{M}^6$ through uniform distributions. The pre-defined error criterion was taken to be 0.0001. The results are given in the histogram in Fig. 1.

We see that most of the Bell states respect the CGLMP inequality. Out of the 1000 states, it is found that only 8.9% violate the CGLMP inequality. A polynomial fit shows the population of the sampled states decreasing as a function of I_4, at a rate $(I_4)^{-x}$, where



Figure 1: (colour online) I_4 values for 1000 randomly sampled pure states, with a bin-width of 0.1. Red: Polynomial fit showing population decay. Black: $I_4 = 2$, demarcation between local and non-local states.

$x = 3.66 \pm 0.49$ (see Fig. 1). This reflects the sparsity of states that obey the CGLMP criterion for non-locality in contrast to the Bell criterion. In fact, there is only one state with $I_4 > 2\sqrt{2}$ from among the 1000 random states.

2. Mixed states

The space of mixed states is much larger, being of dimension 15. We examine the rather small subset of states which have the basis states $|\eta_i\rangle$ (Eq. 8) as their eigenstates.

$$\rho_{\mathcal{H}_+} = \sum_i p_i |\eta_i\rangle\langle\eta_i|. \tag{12}$$

Once again, we find that the CGLMP prescription fails to identify non-locality, this time more dramatically. We sample 100 random mixed states, and implement the Nelder-Mead optimisation technique, in the same manner that was done for pure states. Fig. 2 shows the maximum I_4 values obtained for each state. All of these states have values of I_4 very close to zero, despite being maximally Bell non-local.

It is clear from Figs. 1, 2 that CGLMP is not necessarily stronger than Bell, and that it fails to identify a large family of non-local states, unless perhaps they are maximally entangled. Since it fares well for fully entangled states, we examine if I_4 is more sensitive to entanglement of the state.

3. CGLMP measure and entanglement

We consider pure Bell states. The eigenvalues of the reduced density matrix are two fold degenerate and can



Figure 2: (colour online) I_4 values for 100 randomly sampled mixed states, with a bin width 0.002.



Figure 3: (colour online) I_4 plotted as a function of entanglement, $(1-|P|)$.

be written as

$$\mu_{\pm} = \frac{1}{4}(1 \pm P); \quad |P| \leq 1. \tag{13}$$

The quantity $1-|P|$ is a measure of entanglement, with $|P| = 0$ representing a fully entangled state, and $|P| = 1$, a partially entangled state with the corresponding entropy of the reduced density matrix being $\log 2$.

Fig. 3 shows the variation of I_4 with respect to $1-|P|$ for the 1000 states employed earlier. The scatter in the plot clearly shows that I_4 bears no affinity to entanglement either, except in the limiting case of maximum entanglement.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The main result of this paper is that CGLMP inequality (and its equivalent formulation [1]), as a measure of non-locality, fails to identify a large class of Bell states, both in pure and mixed sectors. It is also not sensitive to entanglement, except when the state is also fully entangled. There are many measures of non-classicality such as discord, entanglement and non-locality. Though undoubtedly a measure of non-classicality, it is not clear whether a CGLMP violation reflects some or all of these measures, or if it gives a new measure. Strictly speaking, Bell and CGLMP criteria are based on two independent notions of non-locality, even if they agree in the case of 2×2 systems. Therefore, it must be admitted that the precise non-classical nature of even those states which respect Bell but violate CGLMP still remains to be understood. Notwithstanding these reservations, there is no doubt that the ingenious experiments which have verified CGLMP violation [9–13] have indeed detected a non-trivial non-classical feature of quantum states in higher dimensions which is not available for two qubit states.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Radha thanks the Department of Science and Technology (DST), India for funding her research under the WOS-A Women's Scientist Scheme. Soumik thanks Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), India for funding his research.

[1] D. Kaszlikowski, P. Gnaciński, M. Żukowski, W. Miklaszewski, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4418 (2000).
[2] D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 040404 (2002).
[3] L. Fu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 130404 (2004).
[4] A. Fine, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 291 (1982).
[5] T. Durt, D. Kaszlikowski, and M. Żukowski, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 024101 (2001).
[6] J.-L. Chen, D. Kaszlikowski, L. C. Kwek, C. H. Oh, and M. Żukowski, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 052109 (2001).
[7] D. Kaszlikowski, L. C. Kwek, J.-L. Chen, M. Żukowski, and C. H. Oh, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032118 (2002).
[8] B. Cirel'son, Lett.Math.Phys. **4**, 93 (1980).
[9] J. Howell, A. Lamas-Linares, and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 030401 (2002).
[10] A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 240401 (2002).
[11] R. T. Thew, A. Acín, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 010503 (2004).
[12] A. Dada *et al.*, Nature Physics **7**, 677 (2011).

[13] H.-P. Lo, C.-M. Li, A. Yabushita, Y.-N. Chen, C.-W. Luo, and T. Kobayashi, Scientific reports **6**, 22088 (2016).

[14] S. Braunstein, A. Mann, and M. Revzen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3259 (1992).

[15] S. Popescu and D. Rohrlich, Physics Letters A **169**, 411 (1992).

[16] J. A. Nelder and R. Mead, The Computer Journal **7**, 308 (1965).